DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 462 378 SP 040 532

AUTHOR Kraft, Nancy P.
TITLE Standards in Teacher Education: A Critical Analysis of NCATE, INTASC, and NBPTS (A Conceptual Paper/Review of the Research).
PUB DATE 2001-04-00
NOTE 29p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (Seattle, WA, April 10-14, 2001).
PUB TYPE Reports - Evaluative (142) -- Speeches/Meeting Papers (150)
EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Academic Standards; *Accreditation (Institutions); *Educational Policy; Elementary Secondary Education; Higher Education; *National Standards; Quality Control; *Teacher Certification; Teacher Competency Testing
IDENTIFIERS Interstate New Teacher Assess and Support Consort; National Board for Professional Teaching Standards

ABSTRACT

This paper analyzes research on accreditation, licensure, and certification standards that have impacted teacher education programs, providing a historical perspective of how and why standards came about in teacher education and examining each of the standards bodies in teacher education: the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE) and the Interstate New Teacher Assessment and Support Consortium (INTASC). Certification standards developed by the National Board of Professional Teaching Standards (NBPTS) are also examined. Using a policy analysis framework grounded in critical theory, these standards are examined from the perspectives of the challenges, limitations, and problems inherent in standards-setting processes for institutions of higher education. The study involved an ERIC search and searches of Web sites of national organizations involved in higher education standards. The analysis provides information about how policies inherent in the standards reproduce the workings of the school and of society; the impact of the context on the standard setting and implementation process; how the policies address curricular issues, pedagogy, and evaluation; whose values count as knowledge and are represented in policy, and how those values become institutionalized; and which implicit assumptions are found within educational policies advanced by the standards movement in higher education. (Contains 49 endnotes.) (SM)

Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made
from the original document.

ED 462 378

SP

Standards in Teacher Education: A Critical Analysis of NCATE, INTASC, and NBPTS

(A Conceptual Paper/Review of the Research)

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Nancy P. Kraft

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

1

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

- ☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
- ☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
- • Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

Nancy P. Kraft
Assistant Professor
University of Kansas
nkraft@ukans.edu

American Educational Research Association Annual Meeting, Seattle, WA, April 2001

SP040532

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Standards in Teacher Education: A Critical Analysis of NCATE, INTASC, and NBPTS
(A Conceptual Paper/Review of the Research)

Just as K-12 schools have jumped on the standards "bandwagon" the same is true for those institutions of higher education (IHEs) that prepare the future teacher workforce. Given the popular movement in the nation and endorsement by Congress and the current administration to continue to seek more standards and higher accountability in education, it is imperative to deconstruct the standards movement from a critical perspective and to raise questions that currently are not being asked or addressed. While the standards in teacher education are still, for the most part, voluntary in nature, the reality is that new teacher licensure systems in states are granting teacher licenses on the basis of how well teachers meet the standards. Also, for those Schools of Education who choose to participate in the NCATE process, future accreditation will be determined by how well they measure up to the standards. If the standards are as worthwhile as their authors contend, then they must be held up to critical scrutiny. The standards movement could be the impetus for continued discussion, dialogue, and debate concerning quality education practices.

This paper is a conceptual and critical analysis of the research/literature on accreditation, licensure, and certification standards that have impacted teacher education programs. To provide a context for the standards movement, an historical perspective of how and why standards came about in teacher education will be briefly discussed. An overview of each of the standards bodies in teacher education – the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE) and the Interstate New Teacher Assessment and Support Consortium (INTASC) will be examined along with certification standards developed by the National Board of Professional Teaching Standards (NBPTS). Using a policy analysis framework grounded in critical theory, these standards will be examined from the perspective of the challenges, limitations, and problems inherent in standards-setting processes for IHEs. The paper concludes with suggestions for how standards might contribute positively to teacher education programs.

Theoretical Framework Grounding the Study

In analyzing the ways that the standards movement has impacted teacher education, this paper uses a social science paradigm grounded in critical theory as the basis of policy analysis. According to Carr and Kemmis

> paradigm embodies the particular conceptual framework through which the community of researcher operates and in terms of which a particular interpretation of 'reality' is generated. It also incorporates models of research, standards, rules of enquiry and a set of techniques and methods,...consistent with the view of reality that the paradigm supports (p. 72).[1]

Many policy analysis models, especially those using empirical-analytic rules or a subjectivist-relativist position, have done simplistic analyses without attending to issues of power, control, legitimacy, privilege, equity, justice, and most importantly values. Given a belief that policy is the "authoritative allocation of values," it then becomes necessary to inquire about what counts as knowledge and whose values are being validated through policy? Critical theory, on the other hand, provides a basis for analysis grounded in goals of using a critical theory approach to unearth or uncover implicit assumptions in the policies themselves as "any serious approach to policy analysis has, therefore, to devise a way of making such assumptions explicit, therefore clarifying not only the model of the policy system involved but also the underlying philosophy of science and theory of society."[2]

While the rhetoric of educational policy is about change and improvement of schooling practices or educational results, the reality is much at variance with professed intentions, and in case after case the resiliency of established practices is documented in the literature. Real and significant educational reform will not come about through a revolution in decision making and managerial technology. Fundamental change will not be achieved through the application of better administrative theory, or tighter, more effective techniques of control. Real change will come about through the achievement of a greater consensus about basic values and a greater understanding about the relationship between schools, society, and the realisation of human potential.[3] Applying this to policy analysis, Prunty's suggests "signposts" for a critical policy analysis that involves belief in, and commitment to the following tenets:

1. As part of a critical analysis political, social, and economic arrangements where persons are never treated as means to an end, but treated as ends in their own right, is endorsed;
2. A critical analysis strives to expose the sources of domination, repression, and exploitation that are entrenched in, and legitimated by, educational policy;
3. Analysis of a policy in terms of curriculum (what counts as knowledge), pedagogy (what counts as valid transmission of knowledge), and evaluation (what counts as valid realization of knowledge requires close scrutiny to the process of validation and to the principles of inclusion and exclusion in deciding "what counts;"
4. An analysis of the attempts (or lack of) by disenfranchised groups to influence the workings of the school; and
5. A commitment to praxis – the unity of thought and action, theory and practice.[4]

Methods of Inquiry

To study the effects and impact of the standards movement in IHEs an ERIC search was conducted using the following identifying terms: standards, higher education, teacher education, accreditation, certification, licensure, schools of education, etc. WEB sites of the national organizations/associations involved in higher education standards settings processes (i.e., the National Board of Professional Teaching Standards, NCATE, the CCSSO – the Council of Chief State School Officers, the NEA – National Education Association, etc.) were also used as an information source. Literature found in this search consisted of several types: 1) literature documenting the standards movement from an historical perspective; 2) literature that was purely theoretical in nature or speculative about the standards movement in teacher education; and 3) research studies that examined some aspect of the implementation of standards in higher education.

Using a critical theory policy framework, an analysis of the standards movement was conducted to determine limitations and challenges in the field. Questions guiding this analysis included:

1. How do policies inherent in the standards reproduce the workings of the school and the workings of society?
2. What is the impact of the context (i.e., socio-political, cultural, historical, economic) on the standard setting and implementation process?
3. How do these policies address curricular issues (what counts as knowledge), pedagogy (what counts as valid transmission of knowledge), and evaluation (what counts as valid realization of knowledge)?
4. Whose values count as knowledge, whose values are represented in policy, and how do these values become institutionalized; and

5. What implicit assumptions are found within educational policies advanced by the standards movement in higher education?

Standards in Teacher Education From an Historical Perspective

Standards setting processes in teacher education programs have had a long history. In 1927 the American Association of Teachers Colleges was established to develop standards and procedures for accrediting teacher education programs that guaranteed graduates of accredited programs would competently perform services for which they were specifically prepared. About 25 years later, in 1954, the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education – a voluntary accrediting organization was established. The mission of NCATE then, as it still is today, was the development of rigorous standards for teacher preparation programs and processes to determine which Schools of Education (SOEs) measure up to them.

Several events within the past 20 years have put the standards setting movement in higher education into high gear. First, the 1983 publication of "*A Nation at Risk*" generated much fear and concern that American schools were lagging behind most developed nations. The end result of that report was the unprecedented standards-setting movement in the late 1980s, first with content standards in the disciplines beginning with mathematics in 1989, and then with student performance standards legislated by the federal government in two pieces of legislation – the Goals 2000: Educate America Act and the Improving America's Schools Act (IASA) of 1994. In addition to these, calls came from the national level for IHEs to prepare teachers who were more adequately qualified, caring, and committed to teaching in our nation's classrooms. *Promising Practices: New Ways to Improve Teacher Quality*, a report that evolved from the Presidents' Summit on Teacher Quality, stated

> teaching is the essential profession, the one that makes all other professions possible...Accordingly, what teachers know and are able to do is of critical importance to the nation, as is the task of preparing and supporting the career-long development of teachers' knowledge and skills (p. 1).[5]

This was the conclusion that emerged from the work of the National Commission on Teaching and America's Future – a 26-member bipartisan blue-ribbon panel, consisting of public officials, business and community leaders, and educators, formed in 1994 and supported by the Rockefeller Foundation and the Carnegie Corporation of New York. The mission of the Commission was to provide an action agenda for meeting America's educational challenges, connecting the quest for higher student achievement with the need for teachers who are knowledgeable, skillful, and committed to meeting the needs of all students.[6] The Commission believed that if reform was to occur at the elementary and secondary level, a restructuring of the foundation – the teaching profession – was a prerequisite. This restructuring was based on two premises: increasing teachers' knowledge to meet the demands they face, and redesigning schools to support high-quality teaching and learning. The Commission concluded that "children can reap the benefits of current knowledge about teaching and learning only if schools and schools of education are dramatically redesigned" (p. 194).[7]

The need is great and warranted for qualified teachers. By 2007, the projected enrollment in our nation's schools will be nearly three million more children than today, bringing the total to 54 million children and youth. This means that the demand for new teachers will increase over the next decade with more than two million teachers required to be hired to match the enrollment in elementary and secondary classrooms. To ease the demand school districts often are in a bind to lower their standards and hire less qualified teachers. This has been the case in high-poverty communities, where shortages of qualified teachers have already

reached critical proportions, especially in areas such as science, mathematics, bilingual education, and special education. This is particularly true in states with the fastest growing population such as California, Nevada, Florida, and Texas. The National Commission on teaching and America's Future found that students in the schools with the highest minority enrollments – usually schools in high-poverty areas – have less than a 50 percent chance of having a science or math teacher with a license or degree in the field he/she teaches.[8]

Another problem inherent in teacher education is that teachers do not receive the same training across all IHEs that prepare teachers. Darling-Hammond sums up the problem as

> some teachers have very high levels of skills – particularly in states that require a bachelor's degree in the discipline to be taught – along with course work in teaching, learning, curriculum, and child development; extensive practice teaching; and a master's degree in education. Others learn little about their subject matter or about teaching, learning, and child development – particularly in states that have low requirements for licensing (p. 194).[9]

To ensure quality in teaching, standards for what beginning and experienced teachers should know and be able to do have been developed. To accomplish this task three groups – the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education, the Interstate New Teacher Assessment and Support Consortium, and the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards – have collaborated in their efforts to establish a complementary system of standards within three interconnected systems: 1) accreditation, 2) state licensing of new teachers, and 3) board certification of accomplished teachers that address a continuum from teacher pre-service preparation to certification.

1. **Accreditation.** The National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education is the professional accrediting organization for schools, colleges, and departments of education in the United States. It is a coalition of over 30 organizations representing teachers, teacher educators, policy makers, and the public. Institutions of higher education that are accredited by NCATE must demonstrate how teacher preparation programs prepare teachers to teach to the student standards developed by professional discipline/content associations, such as the National Council of Teachers of Mathematics (NCTM) or the National Council of Teachers of English (NCTE). These IHEs are also accountable in showing how they prepare teachers to meet new licensing standards for content knowledge and skill in curriculum planning, assessment, classroom management, teaching strategies for diverse learners, and collaboration with parents and colleagues. Schools of Education participate in the NCATE process on a voluntary basis with about 500 of the 1,200 teacher education programs currently seeking NCATE approval.

Having undergone major revisions in the early 1980s, NCATE has just recently once again redefined itself and undergone another round of change. As national assessments, such as the National Assessment of Education Progress (NAEP) and the Third International Mathematics and Science Study (TIMSS), have revealed that student achievement in the United States supposedly lags behind that of students in other industrial countries, the standards movement in higher education has taken an even firmer hold. The new NCATE focus is now on "finding reliable and valid ways to assess teachers' performance – the ability to integrate content with ways to teach it to students in the diverse classrooms of today" (p. 615).[10] In the fall of 2001, IHE's accredited by NCATE started to use new standards that showed how teacher candidates graduating from these schools demonstrated mastery of the content knowledge in their fields and teaching effectiveness. Among the changes in NCATE standards and processes include: 1) colleges will now have to prove through testing that teacher candidates actually are learning the material, not just tallying up the

number of courses taken and passed; 2) rather than just completing student teaching, students must demonstrate that they actually learned the material; 3) instead of only showing they took a technology course, teacher candidates will have to demonstrate they can use technology in teaching; 4) students must demonstrate that they can teach all students, including low-income and minority students; and 5) colleges of education must conduct follow-up surveys to determine whether graduates are effective teachers.

2. **Licensing.** NCATE's standards correlate with those developed for the next check on quality by the Interstate New Teacher Assessment and Support Consortium (INTASC). Formed in 1987 and sponsored by the Council of Chief State School Officers (CCSSO), this consortium of nearly 40 states and professional organizations is guided by one basic premise: an effective teacher must be able to integrate content knowledge with pedagogical understanding to assure that all students learn and perform at high levels. The work of this body has been the creation of a set of performance standards for beginning teacher licensing that is organized around ten principles reflecting the core knowledge, skills, and dispositions teachers should develop in order to teach in the ways required by the new standards for students. To measure the standards, INTASC has also developed examinations that assess teaching in terms of how well teachers can 1) plan and teach for understanding, 2) connect their lessons to students' prior knowledge and experiences, 3) help students who are not initially successful, and 4) analyze the results of their practice on student learning, and adjust it accordingly.

The core standards are also being translated into standards for content-specific teaching with mathematics, English/language arts, and science comprising the first three disciplines. Standards for history/social studies, the arts, elementary education, and special education are also being planned. A growing number of states have adapted and adopted the INTASC standards to guide their move toward performance-based licensing and program approval reforms. INTASC standards are complimentary to standards for highly accomplished practice as articulated by, and based on certification processes established by the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards.[11]

3. **Certification.** The third member of this triad concerned with quality assurance is the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards that was established in 1987 on the recommendation of the Carnegie Task Force on teaching as a profession in their pivotal report – *A Nation Prepared: Teachers for the 21st Century.*[12] The mission of the National Board is

> to establish high and rigorous standards for what accomplished teachers should know and be able to do, to develop and operate a national voluntary system to assess and certify teachers who meet these standards, and to advance related education reforms for the purpose of improving student learning in American schools.[13]

A majority of the National Board's 63 members are outstanding classroom teachers. The remaining members include school board members, governors, legislators, administrators, and teacher educators.

To become certified, teachers with at least three years of teaching experience complete and submit for Board review a year-long portfolio illustrating their teaching through lesson plans, samples of student work over time, videotapes, and analyses of their teaching. As part of this process teachers take tests of content as well as pedagogical knowledge to demonstrate their ability to create and evaluate curriculum materials and teaching situations. During the initial four years that the NBPTS had been in existence (i.e., between November 1994 and November 1998), 1, 837 teacher had gone through this voluntary certification process. Now two and a half years later, nearly an additional 7,700 teachers have been certified with the total reaching 9,524 as of December, 2000. North Carolina, currently leading the nation with 2,407 Board-

certified teachers, has incorporated NBPTS standards into their school improvement plans and has passed legislation that addresses teacher compensation and provides incentives for National Board certification. A proposal going before the Washington state legislature convening in January, 2001 would give a 15 percent pay increase to teachers who successfully completed NBPTS certification and includes plans to financially support up to 600 teachers going through the process over the next four years.[14] Thirty-nine states currently provide some kind of incentive for teachers to pursue certification that includes helping to pay the $2000 fee. Kansas, for instance, has proposed to pay $1000 of the $2000 fee for a limited number of teachers going through the certification process. Other incentives include freeing teachers from some of their other duties to work on the certification process.

A Comparative Analysis of Teacher Education Standards

Two major sets of standards provide guidance for teacher education programs – the NCATE Standards and the INTASC Standards. A third set of standards, the NBPTS, comprise standards for quality teaching once in the field. While the standards each have a different function, i.e. teacher education accreditation (NCATE), initial licensing (INTASC), and advanced certification (NBPTS), they reinforce and compliment each other through the kinds of criteria each requires in addressing the standards. Table 1 in Appendix A illustrates how the standards overlap and are differentiated. Criteria identifying and clarifying each set of standards is found in Appendix B.

The NCATE standards provide for a shared vision of a School of Education's efforts in preparing educators to work effectively in PreK-12 schools. While these standards establish a conceptual framework to provide direction for programs, courses, teaching, candidate performance, scholarship, service, and unit accountability, only Standard 1 under Candidate Performance will be addressed. This comprehensive standard addresses how SOEs should provide teacher candidates with knowledge, skills, and dispositions to be an effective teacher. This includes both having and demonstrating in-depth knowledge of the subject matter that they plan to teach; necessary pedagogical skills that allow them to provide multiple explanations and instructional strategies so that all students learn; the ability to make learning authentic, meaningful, connected and grounded in school, family and community contexts; the capacity to research their practice through collecting and analyzing data related to their work, engage in reflective practice and make necessary adjustments to enhance student learning; the ability to assess, analyze, and continually monitor student learning; and to work effectively with students, families, and communities reflecting the dispositions expected of professional educators.

An Analysis of the Standards' Challenges, Limitations, and Problems

There have been many criticisms waged against the standards movement and questions raised about the ultimate impact that standards at any level can have on improving education. Some criticize the standards movements in saying that it "neglects large issues and constructs in search for a simple, quick-fix solution" and that it puts a smoke screen over the real problems facing education – poorly financed schools (p.1).[15] Others believe that standards can make a difference, but believe that the emphasis is misplaced. In probing how standards in teacher education programs have impacted quality teaching and learning, the analysis will be informed by examining standards from multiple perspectives and stakeholders – Schools of Education and faculty; the state, district, and school levels in the form of policies and support; and the implications of standards on the individual teacher, him/herself. The analysis is divided into four major categories with multiple subsections – 1) criticisms specific to NCATE; 2) criticisms about the relationships between NCATE, INTASC, and NBPTS and teacher education; 3) criticisms concerning measurement and scoring practices; and 4) criticisms specifically aimed at the NBPTS body of standards.

1. Criticisms About the NCATE Standards

(1) Criticisms concerning control of NCATE. The National Council for the Accreditation of Teacher Education has established standards that guide the work of IHEs in the preparation of both teacher candidates as well as teachers, seeking an advanced degree. Throughout its 50 plus years of existence, controversy has surrounded the NCATE accreditation process. Criticisms have been raised in several areas such as questioning who has ultimate control in defining NCATE's standards. While four major groups comprise governorship of NCATE: 1) the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education (AACTE); 2) the National Education Association (NEA) and the American Federation of Teachers (AFT); 3) a variety of subject area and educational specialist organizations such as the NCTM, or the NCTE; and 4) chief state school officers and members of boards of education, critics claim that the NEA has too much control.

(2) Criticisms concerning the complexity of the NCATE process. Other criticisms from AACTE members have focused on how cumbersome they feel the process of accreditation is as well as the quality of NCATE's standards. In fact during the 1970s, a study, the Wheeler Report, conducted at Michigan State University found extreme discontent among SOEs with both the content of the standards and the way those standards were being applied during onsite visits.[16] During this time period, a group of deans, primarily from land-grant teacher education institutions across the country, questioned the quality of the accreditation process with several prominent teacher education universities withdrawing from NCATE and opting to establish state-level accreditation instead. Schools of Education that are considered to be among the best in the nation, i.e., the University of Wisconsin, have not participated in NCATE for quite some time. Consequently, one needs to ask then what is the value of accreditation when SOEs with reputations for quality programs choose not to participate?

2. Criticisms Concerning the Relationship Between Teacher Education and the Standards

(1) Limitations within teacher education itself. The authors of a study that examined the redesign of NCATE question whether the controversy says more about the workings of NCATE or more about teacher education in the United States.[17] Another report that studied the relationship of NCATE and NBPTS and how this partnership encourages SOEs to develop standards-based master's degree programs found six barriers that interfere with the authentic redesign of master's programs: 1) isolation and lack of a collegial culture; 2) numbers over quality; 3) status of the master's degree; 4) structural barriers; 5) conceptual barriers; and 6) bureaucratic barriers.[18] The first barrier, isolation and lack of a collegial culture, is a reality of the way in which higher education is structured with its emphasis on specialization. If professors within SOEs do not model collegial relationships how can we expect teacher candidates to have these skills in schools? With the training of faculty in narrow specializations and eclectic research interests, it becomes difficult to develop a coherent program focused on similar ends. Related to this concern are structural barriers that include work load, promotion, and tenure standards that seem to work against a collegial and collaborative culture among and between disciplines in IHEs. There are problems as well programmatically – how can courses that focus on methods as well as those that focus on content be linked to the standards? While many IHEs are beginning to offer assistance for teachers preparing for Board certification, without attention across the master's curriculum to the essential elements of the process – reflection, systematic inquiry, and collaboration – Diez and Blackwell believe that such incorporation may "in fact be meaningless" (p. 21).[19]

If standard setting processes via NCATE, NBPTS, or INTASC are going to be constructive in contributing to quality teacher education programs, we have to seriously consider many questions. Among these are how

do we change entrenched systems and ways of operating, how do we incorporate professional development schools into the mainstream of teacher preparation, what incentives can be used to encourage professional accreditation of schools of education, or how can school districts encourage Board certification, so that the system develops a cadre of these recognized professionals in a reasonable time?[20] Tensions in SOEs between the old guard and old ways of doing things and the new faculty and new approaches need to be resolved if standards will make a difference in higher education programs. Contradictions are inherent in the present system – faculty will resist as long as tenure decisions continue to be made the same way. If one part of the system is going to be held accountable, how does the other part of the system change to facilitate meeting accountability requirements?

(2) Contradictory goals of the standards. There seem to be contradictions between creating teachers who are autonomous, reflective practitioners, and the continual attempt to deskill teachers by regulating what and how they teach through the increased reliance on standards and accountability measures. Eisner says

> much of the current debate concerning the improvement of schooling both in the United States and the United Kingdom is centered on the appropriateness of prescriptions by federal authorities of common national standards, or as is the case in the United Kingdom, a national curriculum. When the public becomes concerned about the quality of education provided in its schools, it tends to have two reactions. The first is to monitor more closely than it has in the past the performance of schools; this is called accountability. Second, it reiterates in the public forum its national (or state) goals for education. Through standardization of assessment and prescriptive curriculum, that is, by tightening up and reducing the professional discretional space for teachers, efforts are made to create more educationally productive schools. Ironically, at the same time that such standardization is occurring, education policies are being promoted that urge that teachers, as the primary professional stakeholders, should have greater professional discretion in program planning and in monitoring and governing "their" schools (p. 71-72).[21]

Consequently there is a collision between the beliefs underlying the standards movement and encouragement for teachers to assume more professional autonomy. Another related issue is the assumption that the mandated knowledge covered in the standards comprises what is perceived to be "legitimate" knowledge in a given field. One only needs to examine the contentiousness of the standards setting process with the history standards to realize how multiple perspectives on the history of this nation resulted in contrary view of what history content should consist.

The reality is that standards in the disciplines, state standards and assessments define the content and the process of the curriculum. This is especially true in states with high stakes testing practices such as Texas and the TASS test (Texas Assessment of Academic Skills) or in Massachusetts where students can graduate from high school only after successfully completing the state assessment. The current push to tie teacher salaries to test scores, as has been proposed in Los Angeles and other cities, or the practice of states publishing school report cards, or tying monies that schools receive to how well schools do, as in Kentucky, has deep ramifications for teacher professionalism. Other contradictions exist in states where State Boards of Education assume too much control in deciding what constitutes legitimate content in a discipline, such as the 1999 decision in Kansas that relegates the teaching of evolution to local board control. One needs to ask how tests or decisions such as these that define very specifically the content of the curriculum respect teachers as autonomous professionals and intellectuals or enable them to teach the latest research-based content in their classrooms, which is one of the standards reflected in all three sets of standards – NCATE, INTASC, and NBPTS?

(3) Criticisms based on the presumed superficiality of the standards. Another major issue confronting standards has to do with "how to get beyond the superficiality of the standards themselves." The standard are full of education jargon that, unless deconstructed, remain at the rhetorical level. Such is the case with standards that address issues like "understanding diversity." To address this standard SOEs often require one course in multicultural education, believing that this will be sufficient to prepare students to understand the issues underlying diversity or to teach in settings with multiple ethnicities. But if such a course does not enable students to better understand the multiple issues or underlying conditions of diverse populations, from the perspective of race, class, ethnicity, gender, disability, etc., or help students to critically assess their beliefs, values, and assumptions of "otherness," then students may possess a shallow understanding of the issues surrounding diversity and be ill-prepared to either teach their students about diversity or to work in school settings with diverse populations.

The same is true with the fourth proposition of the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards – "teachers think systematically about their practice and learn from experience." Implementing this standard requires that SOEs provide pre-service and practicing teachers with background knowledge and experience in systematic inquiry into practice, reflection on practice, and collaboration with others in meeting learners' needs – which are at the core of the standards. Reflection is one of those buzzwords in education today that everyone uses and says they are doing. But in reality, there are two types of reflection that define teacher work – technical reflection and critical reflection. Technical reflection is the "kind of thinking teachers use in making pedagogical decisions about learning environments, content selection, teaching methods, and student learning needs" (p. 108).[22] On the other hand, critical reflection is defined as the kind of reflective thinking that teachers use to consciously question the moral and ethical implications and consequences of their personal and professional beliefs and practices on their students. It involves a process of bringing into question the beliefs, values, and assumptions about teaching, learning, students, curriculum, etc. – that guide practice in classrooms and schools. Zeichner and Liston believe

> if a teacher never questions the goals and the values that guide his or her work, the context in which he or she teachers, or never examines his or her assumptions, then it is our belief that this individual is not engaged in reflective teaching (p. 1).[23]

If reflective thinking is going to enable teachers to think systematically about their practice and learn from their experiences, Zehm and Kottler believe that it needs to be more than technical reflection and should involve asking why, finding patterns, reading voraciously, taking time for contemplation, examining your own behavior, confronting excuses, and defining your professional mission.[24] With well over 1000 IHEs with teacher education programs and numerous faculty involved in teacher preparation one has to ask how faculty interpret and implement reflection in their teacher training programs? It is obvious from the increasing proliferation of papers on teacher research and reflective practice being presented at the American Education Research Association annual meetings that more and more SOEs are incorporating "teacher- or action research" into teacher education programs. A closer examination of many of these reveals that action research and reflective practice has been defined as "technical reflection" with an end result of teachers doing bad research and not a matter of teachers critically examining belief systems or interrogating their practices, which is at the heart of reflection that defines quality teaching.

Another example is standard five of the NBPTS that states "teachers are members of learning communities" and as such should work creatively and collaboratively with colleagues, parents, and the community. This is consistent with standard ten of the INTASC standards that says "the teacher communicates, interacts with, and fosters relationships with school colleagues, parents, and agencies in the larger community to support students' learning and well-being," and part 5 under standard one of NCATE

that specifies that teacher candidates work with students, families, and communities..." While the core of this standard is about creating collegial relationships and partnerships with professional peers as well as the larger community the reality in schools is otherwise. Collegial work is not the norm with many forms of collaboration constituting superficial, partial, or even counterproductive tasks.

Fullan and Hargreaves differentiate between congenial collegiality and contrived collegiality and conclude that congenial collegiality is often merely comfortable collaboration.[25] While it might involve sharing, exchanging, coordinating, celebrating, and supporting, there is virtually no talk about inquiry and reflection on practice. Contrived collegiality, on the other hand, is characterized by a '"set of formal, specific, bureaucratic procedures to increase the attention being given to joint teacher planning, consultation and other forms of working together" (p. 58).[26] If teacher dialogue that helps them to question their practices is not part of these "collegial" processes, there is no assurance that collaboration will result in higher quality student learning. What is required instead, are approaches to critical collegiality that involve a commitment to processes that will help us to reflect on practice critically and make changes based on these reflections. So if the reality in most schools is contrary to the expectations of the standards, how can individual teachers possibly meet the standards? How do the standards force school to become more collegial?

(4) Criticisms based on the limitations of the standards themselves. Related to the superficiality issue is another concern that focuses on substantive issues related to the standards addressing moral purposes rather than merely ensuring scientific knowledge. Blackwell asserts

> standards devoid of moral purpose will not satisfy these three requirements: how to attract teachers to the profession, how to make sure teachers are well-trained for the challenges they will face in the classroom, and how to induce teachers to stay in the profession (p. 2-3).[27]

She continues that the current standards movement in higher education, specifically those fostered by INTASC is only a piecemeal, rather than systemic, approach at reforming the system. Without linking standards for improving the preparation of teachers to the renewal of schools, she believes that little will be accomplished. Student success in schools, after all, is more than achieving high test scores. According to Goodlad, it has to do with teachers 1) facilitating critical enculturation – teaching students to critically understand and examine the culture – rather than the indoctrination of students into the culture; 2) providing access to knowledge; 3) building an effective teacher-student connection – developing teachers who are sensitive to children's needs and placing a priority on relationship building; and 4) practicing good stewardship – concerned about all children, not just their own, and all the programs and structures.[28] While the standards talk about giving new teachers the knowledge, skills, and dispositions to become teachers, they do not address processes required by teachers to be successful in a system where a "this too shall pass" mentality often persists. Questions that need to be asked include how is the renewal of schools linked with the preparation of beginning teachers, how do the standards ensure that teachers will not become stagnant, or how do the standards address teacher survival in schools where resistance to change is the norm?

3. Measurement and Scoring Concerns

(1) Criticisms based on measurement and scoring practices. Many problems are still unresolved concerning how to measure the NCATE, INTASC and NBPTS standards. These concerns include how much is enough, what should be measured, what can be measured or what do we know concerning how to measure? While we can measure behaviors, how do we measure dispositions and who decides, especially

since these comprise value judgments? Other questions include who pays for the results and how do we resolve the costs associated with the standards? If students are supposed to demonstrate what they know, what implications will this have on methods of teacher preparation? If teaching practices at the university level are grounded in lecture format but students are expected to be facilitators of learning once in the field as a practicing teacher, a logical question is how can students, who have been passive reproducers of knowledge now be expected to facilitate learning for their own students? And finally, how will the impact on student learning be measured out in the field? Are standardized tests the most effective means for evaluating student achievement?

Similar issues have been raised with scoring practices used to determine quality teaching specifically looking at the measurement processes used with NBPTS. While the ETS (Education Testing Service) is currently overseeing scoring of the NBPTS process, one needs to question the kinds of training procedures that are used to score the portfolios. How do they ensure inter-rater reader reliability? Where do they find a sufficient number of experienced educators who have the necessary time to participate in this process – to go through the training and then score portfolios? Questions have been raised by educators, who have been involved as assessors, regarding the scoring process – specifically concerning the development and quality of the rubric used to score candidate's portfolios and the access that candidates have to the rubrics during their preparation period.[29] Other questions have been raised concerning qualifications of assessors – how many years of teaching experience should qualify those who participate as scorers? An experienced teacher who was involved in the scoring process noted that there were teachers with as little as two years experience who were scoring candidates' portfolios.[30]

Other criticisms have been raised concerning how the scoring process decontextualizes and compartmentalizes teaching. Rather than using a holistic scoring process, ETS has raters scoring individual exercises. Although the preface of documents supporting Board Certification refers to exemplary teaching as a holistic act "where many facets of practice are joined together to advance student learning" the reality of the assessment process seems otherwise.[31] In critiquing the methods used by ETS, one educator who was involved in the scoring process commented that

> scorers were given coded name tags and separated into groups by the exercise to be scored. Secrecy and isolation seemed part of the assignment. Each scorer responded to one of seven exercises, an efficient method of getting the job done, but certainly alien to me and to what I believe about teaching. It also seems alien to what NBPTS believes. Wouldn't a better understanding of an individual's performance be developed if scorers were trained to respond to all aspects of the portfolio? Why put a portfolio together if it is going to be broken down into separate parts (p. 40)? [32]

Other concerns have been raised about off-site scoring practices when the best way to assess one's teaching ability is perhaps within the local context using local authorities/observers. Does it make more sense to certify expertise on teaching, professional involvement, family outreach, and other factors that the standards try to address in the context in which teaching occurs? How can that be adequately accomplished off-site, when the portfolio scoring process is decontextualized? Some believe that NBPTS has resisted developing a local certification system because such an approach works against a testing company's control of test specifications.[33]

(2) Criticisms concerning cultural bias in scoring NBPTS candidates. Concerns have been raised about possible cultural bias in the NBPTS process and what counts as a "legitimate" teaching experience.[34] Researchers who have studied antecedents of achievement for black students have found a direct correlation

to African-American teachers' pedagogical style with their students. Characteristics and teaching behaviors they have identified include African-American teachers seeing themselves as parental surrogates and advocates for their African-American students; employment of a teaching style filled with rhythmic language and rapid intonation with many instances of repetition, call and response, high emotional involvement, creative analogies, figurative language, gesture and body movements, symbolism, aphorisms, and lively and often spontaneous discussions; and teaching with authority – sometimes defined by students as a teacher's meanness – but perceived by them as pushing them to achieve and running the class in such a manner to ensure students' achievement.[35]

While the overall success rate for candidates vying for Board certification has been 40 percent, the overall pass rate for African-American teachers is only 11 percent. The authors of a study that examined the NBPTS process from the perceptive of race believe

> that there is a very strong possibility that the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards' review process, in spite of its many technical psychometric reports that declare adverse impact but no bias, contains a deeply flawed cultural bias in favor of white, middle-class teacher norms – and against the norms which are seen by many African-American educators as most effective.[36]

Other researchers concur that cultural differences may play a role in how some NBPTS portfolios are read by assessors.[37] Questions need to be asked if the NBPTS process does indeed bias the definition of "good" teaching in ways that privilege white, middle-class, and suburban teachers. Irvine and Fraser believe that the NBPTS should be queried from the perspective of whose standards and which children do the standards serve. Other questions needing to be asked include: Do teachers who work with privileged students have an advantage over teachers who work with poor students? Does the process disadvantage teachers from districts with limited resources? Do the standards favor teachers who use a constructivist teaching style and penalize teachers, like some African-American teachers, who employ more didactic strategies? Will assessors be trained to recognize and appreciate the culturally relevant styles of African-American teachers? Will the low pass rate of African-American teachers contribute to the declining numbers of persons of color who enter teacher education programs?[38] These are critical questions that need to be addressed if the standards movement in teacher education is going to support teaching excellence among all teachers and for all students.

4. Criticisms About the NBPTS process

(1) Criticisms about the limited impact on teaching practices. A study conducted in 1997 determined teachers' views about the incentive to go through the NBPTS certification process, the contribution of the process to their teaching skills, and the consistency between National Board standards and current teaching practices.[39] While the majority of the 28 teachers interviewed in this study believed that the certification process was valuable and contributed to their own sense of professionalism and positive changes in their teaching, a minority found it less useful and not having an impact on current teaching practices. One teacher commented that "the process did not teach her how to teach differently because no one gave her information on ways to improve instruction" (p. 463).[40]

Another study that closely followed four teachers going through the NBPTS certification process found discrepancies between local, contextualized, personal, and oral knowledge of these teachers to the national discourse of the NBPTS standards.[41] While the national standards comprise broad statements about teaching, these tend to get interpreted from multiple perspectives depending on the local context in which

teachers practice. Because the NBPTS does not elaborate on the core propositions, making up the standards, the ways in which they get interpreted at the local level will be dependent on the local context. Thus proposition 3, "Teaches are responsible for managing and monitoring student learning," can be interpreted by one teacher as giving students a series of worksheets while another might see student portfolios as a way to manage and monitor. All four teachers in this study had a difficult time negotiating the meaning of the standards and in particular with representing their practice in writing. The candidates who were most successful embraced the values of the discourse endorsed by NBPTS.

(2) Criticisms concerning the cumbersomeness of the process. The certification process is a lengthy process that requires much work and dedication on the part of teachers to complete this multi-stage process. The actual process involves several steps and various procedures. At the school site, the teacher candidate prepares a school site portfolio with a Planning and Teacher Exercise that includes a videotape of classroom instruction (PTE); a Post-Reading Interpretive Discussion Exercise (PRIDE) that includes a videotape of a class discussion; and a Student Learning Exercise (SLE) that includes samples of student writing and teacher comments about the writing. These three pieces are scored at a central site organized and run by Educational Testing Service (ETS). In addition to these, candidates complete the Instructional Analysis Exercises, with an analysis of a beginning teacher's teaching at an assessment center. They also complete three two-hour essays on the teaching of literature, reading, and language development. With such a time consuming process and without sufficient support services in the form of materials/resources to assist teachers preparing for the certification process or financial support/incentives to participate, what is the impetus for more teachers to become involved and participate in this process?

The low numbers to date of teachers who have successfully gone through this process attests to this fact. "Without major gains in teacher participation, National Board certification is unlikely to have a significant impact on the quality of education" (p. 463).[42] The original goal for teachers receiving national certification was 105,000 within ten years of beginning the process. By November 1998 1,837 had undergone certification and then as of December 2000, 9,524, which is far short of the original goal of over 100,000 teachers. As of November 1998 32 states had 25 or less than its teaching force Board certified with several states such as Arizona, New Hampshire, Utah, Vermont, West Virginia, and Wyoming with only one teacher each as being certified under the National Board of Professional Teaching Standards. As a case in point, Texas with well over 1000 school districts only had seven Board certified teachers as of November 1998. Without the necessary support systems in place to implement this policy, one needs to ask how an additional 95,000 teachers will become certified by 2004.

While many teachers believe this to be a worthwhile process to undertake, the complexity of the process, and the fact that it is so time-consuming, can lead to tensions between standards seen as busy work or viewed as opportunities to critically examine practice. Or the complexity of the process leads to tensions focused on the end product of certification rather than the process of certification. A perception could exist that once one has successfully become Board certified, that he/she has "arrived" and is no longer in need of professional growth. Becoming accredited through the NBPTS becomes a one-time event. How does being Board certified contribute to teachers' ongoing professional growth? Or how does the process of Board certification lend itself to teachers' conceptual understanding of the teaching and learning process when certification seems to reduce teaching to a set of observable tasks? As we ask what do developmentally appropriate experiences look like that move students form simple tasks to complex understandings, the same needs to be asked of teachers?

(3) Criticisms based on adequacy of support systems. When considering how the standards impact quality teaching in the classroom, one first needs to ask what kinds of support systems are in place at the

state, district, and school levels to support teachers. The National Commission on Teaching and America's Future offers suggestions on ways to support and sustain teacher work on problems of practice that are directly connected to student learning.

> Throughout their careers, teachers should have ongoing opportunities to update their skills. In addition to time for joint planning and problem solving with in-school colleagues, teachers should have access to networks, school/university partnerships, and academies where they can connect with other educators to study subject-matter teaching, new pedagogies, and school change (p. 197).[43]

While these are worthy recommendations, unfortunately the reality is that disparities exist across, between, and within states on implementation. In cities across the nation where students are overwhelmingly children of color and children of the poor, where schools must struggle to educate children with considerably fewer human and material resources than neighboring districts have, and where teachers often lack necessary skills, knowledge, and training, one needs to asks "what standards do these represent?"[44] Where is the necessary support in these educational settings to sustain everyday teaching practice, let alone support for teachers to complete board certification requirements?

Support is lacking also given the fact that schools operate within a perspective of naive, rather than critical pragmatism. This often results in school reform and change efforts that follow a "bandwagon" mentality or "silver bullet" approach without a critical assessment of the problem and how best to solve the problem. Transforming curriculum and teaching into rich intellectual inquiry requires educators to confront constructs such as individual differences, intelligence, and behavioral conditioning. Yet the (school environment) reform mill does little to create climates in which teachers can critically examine the historical and theoretical underpinning of these and other ideas. Instead of forming professional communities committed to using knowledge, analytic skill, and critical perspectives to shape their practice, teachers are asked to swallow "expert" prescriptions for such techniques as interdisciplinary units or problem-based learning. Oakes, et al. believe that

> to gain widespread "buy in," reform leaders often grind complex ideas down into catchy slogans, lists of best practices, and vignettes from model schools. Watered-down wisdom makes its way into packaged materials and prescribed "trainings." Such technical assistance nearly always blocks the deep inquiry and learning that fundamental shifts in norms and practices require.[45]

A 1997 study that examined the impact of the certification process of the National Board of Professional Teaching Standards found several factors that contributed to a general lack of support among K-12 institutions for National Board certified teachers.[46] The first had to do with a lack of awareness among K-12 administrators of the NBPTS process or a lack of support in terms of sufficient support services or provision of time to assemble the required portfolio materials. This lack of understanding about the process also resulted in a lack of congruence between K-12 inservice or professional development programs and National Board standards.

(4) Criticisms concerning "opportunity to teach." While the standards are often perceived as an opportunity for teachers to learn more about the profession of teaching and how to work more effectively with students, if schools lack the conditions that make it possible for teachers to be successful, how can teachers be faulted and held accountable? Where is the accountability from the perspective of schools? How can standards help overcome the problems of outdated materials, run-down school building, and

inadequate space? Where is the "opportunity to teach?" In studying the challenge of higher standards the National Council on Education Standards and Testing, a bipartisan task force of educators and legislators created by Congress in the early 1990s's to examine the feasibility and desirability of a national system of education standards and tests, believed that in addition to content and student performance standards should be the formation of *system performance standards*.[47] Standards such as these would assess the success of schools, districts, states, and the nation as a whole in helping all students attain high performance standards.

Concerning standards that would require schools to provide necessary support for teachers, the Rothberg, et al study often found discrepancies in educational philosophy between the NBPTS and K-12 institutions. The realities of school environments, such as large class sizes, often made the standards difficult to implement.[48] To date with all the professional content associations that have developed quality student performance/teaching standards, the only content area that addresses standards or systems of support for quality teaching practices is the field of science. But even with these, where is the accountability on the part of schools to enforce these standards or monetary support from the local, state, and federal levels to ensure that conditions are in place so that teachers have "opportunities to teach?"

A Summary Analysis of the Standards

While this paper has raised many questions that focus on the issue of values concerning the NCATE, INTASC, and NBPTS bodies of standards, this analysis section will briefly summarize these arguments using the five questions that guided this critique of standards in higher education.

1. *How do policies inherent in the standards reproduce the workings of the school and the workings of society?*

   The standards, for the most part, seem to endorse the status quo. Because the standards do not address reforming teaching from the larger context of what goes on in schools and because the focus is primarily on the classroom and what teachers do within those classrooms, this has perpetuated a "deficit" view of teachers and their abilities (see Points 2(2) – dealing with contradictory goals, 2(4) – support systems, and 4(4) – opportunity to teach). The emphasis of these efforts is often on the development of teachers' skills as a means of school improvement rather than looking beyond classrooms and the constraints that impact teachers' "perceptions of their own abilities and possibilities."[49] Thus these standards tend to reproduce the system and the ways that the public looks at the problems in schools (i.e., bad teachers and mediocre teaching) rather than being a springboard for larger discussions concerning adequate monetary support, equalized funding, the stress on teachers and students caused by the increasing calls for more accountability and more testing, etc. The standards seem to endorse teachers' acquiescence to a rigid system rather than challenging an oppressive system. Related to this, the standards also seem to foster a piecemeal, rather than systemic, approach at reforming the system (as addressed under Point 2(4) – limitations of the standards).

2. *What is the impact of the context (i.e., socio-political, cultural, historical, economic) on the standard setting and implementation process?*

   Context is really not addressed in the standards at all, as if K-12 schools and Schools of Education exist in a vacuum. The reality is that what is happening in the larger system certainly has a domino

effect on schools; this can not decontextualized. As addressed in Point 2(2) – contradictory goals and touched on in Point 2(4) – limitations of the standards, there is a larger political agenda out there that is controlling what happens in schools and what counts as legitimate knowledge and that will ultimately impact what is legitimized as constituting both teacher and content knowledge being transferred to teacher candidates in SOEs. Such is the case with accreditation and licensing standards. Schools (and teachers) are already accountable to how well students perform on state assessments. The stress created under this accountability system is leading to increased "teaching to the test" and even "sanctioned" cheating (as long as you don't "get caught") by schools on state assessments. In future years, this accountability moves up the ladder to SOEs, where accreditation and teacher licensure will also be dependent on how graduating teachers' students perform on state assessments.

One needs to critically question what is fueling this quest for higher standards and more rigid accountability? An analysis of the larger context reveals that economic forces are at the center. As long as schools are being integrated into the corporate agenda, the rhetoric of standards – creating professional educators – seems to be taking a back seat to other agendas that focus on creating future workers and employees that will enable business and industry in the United State to be more economically competitive with business and industry in Asian and European countries. Rather than teachers educating students to actively participate in a democracy the thrust seems to be on a conservative agenda that focuses on schooling for economic gain.

3. *How do these policies address curricular issues (what counts as knowledge), pedagogy (what counts as valid transmission of knowledge), and evaluation (what counts as valid realization of knowledge)?*

While the standards address curriculum content and what teachers need to know to be competent in teaching content areas, and ways to teach and measure content taught, the reality is that state assessments really define what counts as knowledge and what are valid ways of assessing that knowledge. In this era of even higher accountability with standardized tests being required at all grade levels on a yearly basis, one needs to question how federal policies impact SOEs in more narrowly defining what constitutes knowledge in the disciplines and how content is to be tested. Point 2(2) – contradictory goals addresses this in looking at the inherent contradictions between creating teachers who are autonomous, reflective practitioners, and the continual attempt to deskill teachers by regulating what and how they teach through the increased reliance on standards and accountability measures.

4. *Whose values count as knowledge, whose values are represented in policy, and how do these values become institutionalized?*

As addressed under Points 4(1) – criticisms with NBPTS process, 3(2) – cultural bias in NBPTS, and 3(1) – measurement and scoring practices, there seems to be an inherent cultural bias in the standards concerning what counts as knowledge and whose values are represented in policy – especially with what constitutes "good teaching" as defined by the NBPTS and ETS, who has developed the rubrics that rate "good teaching." Until questions such as these are addressed the gaps will continue to widen between the numbers of white and African-American teachers who become certified through this process. This raises a larger issue, however, concerning Schools of Education – especially for those that are preparing students for the vast shortages of teachers in our inner city schools. How are the standards helping SOEs to better prepare teachers for urban

teaching experiences – how do SOEs ground their teaching practices in culturally relevant pedagogy? How do we get beyond the mentality that one course in "multi-cultural education" or "diversity" will satisfy that need? And how do we start legitimizing teaching practices that go beyond white, middle-class teacher norms? How can the standards become more inclusionary of giving voice to multiple perspectives?

Point 1(1) – concerns about control of NCATE, also raises some important issues concerning whose values are represented in policy and whose voice counts. Faculty have raised concerns that the NEA has too much control in defining NCATE standards. How can we give equal weight to all voices in the standard setting process? Or as addressed under Point 2(1) – teacher education criticisms, how do we give voice to all faculty (i.e., faculty new to the profession as well as those who are entrenched in the system) in setting and working towards meeting the standards.

5. *What implicit assumptions are found within education policies advanced by the standards movement in higher education?*

The standards are rife with assumptions, as especially addressed in Point 2(3) – issues of superficiality in the standards. First of all an assumption is made that all SOEs endorse the standards, understand what they mean, and know how to go about incorporating them into their educational programs. But as shown in Point 2(3) there are multiple meanings surrounding some of the key phrases that are couched in the standards. How do we ensure consensus of what these mean and how these get implemented in practice?

Points 4(3) – adequacy of support systems and 4(4) – opportunity to teach – have hidden assumptions as well. First of all an assumption is being made that all schools are equal in the support they give to teachers and that all teachers are able to go through the rigorous process to become Board certified. But given the realities in schools, this is not the case. In some schools, teachers are lacking basic support for carrying out their daily responsibilities, let alone the additional kinds of support required to engage in such a process. As illustrated in 4(4) there seems to be discrepancies in educational philosophy between the NBPTS and K-12 institutions. The same is true in higher education – as addressed under Point 2(1) – criticisms within teacher education. The standards will only happen if they are implemented in an environment where educators are conducive to the kinds of tasks being required by the standards. Merely assuming that collegiality occurs or the bureaucracy of the IHE doesn't get in the way, are false assumptions. Success in meeting and addressing the standards will require breaking down many existing barriers to ensure even a limited degree of success.

The Future of Standards in Higher Education

While many problems remain in all the standards branches – accreditation, licensing, and certification – one needs to ask what value if any, do standards have in advancing the field? Standards are important in providing a sense of direction in which to proceed as well as providing a set of priorities upon which to place energy, resources, and efforts. But, as is true with other educational initiatives, the emphasis is often misplaced. First a "one size fits all" mentality seems to exist concerning the standards, disregarding some of the issues and concerns raised throughout this paper. Another problem with standards is that they often become ends in and of themselves, rather than the means to achieve the ends. If the end is about ensuring quality teachers for our nation's children and youth then one of the values of having standards is that they should be used to stimulate debates on what constitutes quality teaching among K-12 schools and within

institutions of higher education.

In K-12 settings the standards, especially the NBPTS and INTASC standards, could be used as a springboard to open a dialogue between teachers, administrators, parents, and the community about quality teaching practices. The standards could become the focus for relevant and authentic staff development training at the school or district level. Teacher supported study groups and staff meetings could focus their attention on the standards through the initiation of meaningful conversations about the standards. Dialogue and reflection on the standards could be used as part of a more authentic teacher evaluation process. Teachers could also be encouraged and supported to participate in the process. In these ways the standards become a means to the end, rather than the goal itself.

To paraphrase an outcome of the President's Summit on Teacher Quality, "teaching is the essential profession, the one that makes all other professions possible...accordingly, what teachers know and are able to do is of critical importance to the nation, as is the task of preparing and supporting the career-long development of teachers' knowledge and skills." In Schools of Education the standards should become the impetus for rethinking teacher education at both the pre-service, in-service, and graduate levels. The standards could provide an opportunity for faculty to engage in debate and dialogue about the content and process of their programs, be used to develop programs that were more coherent in nature, and become the basis for establishing school/university partnerships that were grounded in an authentic collaboration. But until many of the issues that have been raised throughout this paper are addressed, the standards movement may just become one more of those educational initiatives that educators "ride out" with a "this too shall pass" mentality.

Appendix A

Table 1

	NCATE Standards	NBPTS Standards				
INTASC Standards	Standard 1: Candidates possess the appropriate knowledge, skills, and dispositions	Teachers committed to students and their learning	Teachers know the subjects they teach and how to teach those to students	Teachers are responsible for managing and monitoring student learning	Teachers think systematically about their practice and learn from experience	Teachers are members of learning communities
Knowledge of subject matter	X **(criterion 1, 2)**		X			
Knowledge of human development and learning	X **(criterion 2, 3)**	X				
Adapting instruction for individual needs	X **(criterion 2, 3)**	X	X	X		
Multiple instructional strategies	X **(criterion 2, 3)**			X		
Classroom motivation and management skills	X **(criterion 3)**			X		
Communication skills	X **(criterion 3)**			X		
Instructional planning skills	X **(Criterion 1,2, 3)**		X			
Assessment of student learning	X **(criterion 3, 4)**			X		
Professional commitment and responsibility	X **(criterion 3, 4, 6)**			X	X	
Partnership	X **(criterion 5)**					X

Appendix B

NCATE Standards. Standard 1: Candidate Knowledge, Skills, and Dispositions falls within the purview of this paper. Criteria to meet this standard include the following specifications of teacher candidates:

1. They have in-depth knowledge of the subject matter that they plan to teach and are able to demonstrate their knowledge through inquiry, critical analysis, and synthesis, of the subject.

2. They reflect a thorough understanding of pedagogical content knowledge, have an in-depth understanding of the subject matter that they plan to teach, allowing them to provide multiple explanations and instructional strategies so that all students learn, and present the content to students in challenging, clear, and compelling ways and integrate technology appropriately.

3. They reflect a thorough understanding of professional and pedagogical knowledge and skills as shown in their development of meaningful learning experiences to facilitate student learning for all students. They reflect on their practice and make necessary adjustments to enhance student learning. They know how students learn and how to make ideas accessible to them. They consider the school, family, and community contexts in connecting concepts to students' prior experiences, and applying the ideas to real-world problems.

4. They have an in-depth understanding of the professional knowledge demonstrated through the collection and analysis of data related to their work, reflection on their practice, and use of research and technology to support and improve student learning.

5. Their work with students, families, and communities reflects the dispositions expected of professional educators and the are able to recognize when their own dispositions may need adjustment and are able to develop a plan to do so.

6. They accurately assess and analyze student learning, make appropriate adjustments to instruction, monitor student learning, and have a positive effect on learning for all students.

Interstate New Teacher Assessment and Support Consortium (INTASC) Standards

1. Knowledge of subject matter

The teacher understands the central concepts, tools of inquiry, and structures of the discipline(s) he or she teachers and can create learning experiences that make these aspects of subject matter meaningful.

2. Knowledge of human development and learning

The teacher understands how children learn and develop, and can provide learning opportunities that support their intellectual, social and personal development.

3. Adapting instruction for individual needs

The teacher understands how students differ in their approaches to learning and creates instructional opportunities that are adapted to learners from diverse cultural backgrounds and with exceptionalities.

4. Multiple instructional strategies

The teacher understands and uses a variety of instructional strategies to encourage students' development of critical thinking, problem solving and performance skills.

5. Classroom motivation and management skills

The teacher uses an understanding of individual and group motivation and behavior to create a learning environment that encourages positive social interaction, active engagement in learning, and self-motivation.

6. Communication skills

The teacher uses knowledge of effective verbal, nonverbal, and media communication techniques to foster active inquiry, collaboration, and supportive interaction in the classroom.

7. Instructional planning skills

The teacher plans and manages instruction based upon knowledge of subject matter, students, the community, and curriculum goals.

8. Assessment of student learning

The teacher understands and uses formal and informal assessment strategies to evaluate and ensure the continuous intellectual, social and physical development of the learner.

9. Professional commitment and responsibility

The teacher is a reflective practitioner who continually evaluates the effects of his/her choices and actions on others (students, parents, and other professionals in the learning community) and who actively seeks out opportunities to grow professionally.

10. Partnership

The teacher communicates, interacts with, and fosters relationships with school colleagues, parents, and agencies in the larger community to support students' learning and well-being.

National Board of Professional Teaching Standards

The National Board for Professional Teaching Standards seeks to identify and recognize teachers who effectively enhance student learning and demonstrate the high level of knowledge, skills, abilities and commitments reflected in the following five core propositions.

1. Teachers are committed to students and their learning

Accomplished teachers are *dedicated to making knowledge accessible to all students*. They act on the belief that all students can learn. They treat students equitably, recognizing the individual differences that distinguish one student from another and taking account of these differences in their practice. They adjust their practice based on observation and knowledge of their students' interests, abilities, skills, knowledge, family circumstances and peer relationships.

Accomplished teachers *understand how students develop and learn*. They incorporate the prevailing theories of cognition and intelligence in their practice. They are aware of the influence of context and culture on behavior. They develop students' cognitive capacity and their respect for learning. Equally important, they foster students' self-esteem, motivation, character, civic responsibility and their respect for individual, cultural, religious and racial differences.

2. Teachers know the subjects they teach and how to teach those subjects to students

Accomplished teachers *have a rich understanding of the subject(s) they teach and appreciate how knowledge in their subject is created, organized, linked to other disciplines and applied to real-world settings*. While faithfully representing the collective wisdom of our culture and upholding the value of disciplinary knowledge, they also develop the critical and analytical capacities of their students.

Accomplished teachers *command specialized knowledge of how to convey and reveal subject matter to students*. They are aware of the preconceptions and background knowledge that students typically bring to each subject and of strategies and instructional materials that can be of assistance. They understand where difficulties are likely to arise and modify their practice accordingly. Their instructional repertoire allows them to create multiple paths to the subjects they teach, and they are adept at teaching students how to pose and solve their own problems.

3. Teachers are responsible for managing and monitoring student learning

Accomplished teachers *create, enrich, maintain and alter instructional settings to capture and sustain the interest of their students and to make the most effective use of time*. They also are adept at engaging students and adults to assist their teaching and at enlisting their colleagues' knowledge and expertise to complement their own. Accomplished teachers *command a range of generic instructional techniques, know when each is appropriate and can implement them as needed*. They are as aware of ineffectual or damaging practice as they are devoted to elegant practice.

They know how to *engage groups of students to ensure a disciplined learning environment, and how to organize instruction to allow the schools' goals for students to be met*. They are adept at

setting norms for social interaction among students and between students and teachers. They understand how to motivate students to learn and how to maintain their interest even in the face of temporary failure.

Accomplished teachers can assess the progress of individual students as well as that of the class as a whole. They employ multiple methods for measuring student growth and understanding and can clearly explain student performance to parents.

4. Teachers think systematically about their practice and learn from experience

Accomplished teachers are *models of educated persons*, exemplifying the virtues they seek to inspire in students -- curiosity, tolerance, honesty, fairness, respect for diversity and appreciation of cultural differences -- and the capacities that are prerequisites for intellectual growth: the ability to reason and take multiple perspectives to be creative and take risks, and to adopt an experimental and problem-solving orientation.

Accomplished teachers draw on their knowledge of human development, subject matter and instruction, and their understanding of their students to make principled judgments about sound practice. Their decisions are not only grounded in the literature, but also in their experience. They engage in lifelong learning which they seek to encourage in their students.

Striving to strengthen their teaching, accomplished teachers critically examine their practice, seek to expand their repertoire, deepen their knowledge, sharpen their judgment and adapt their teaching to new findings, ideas and theories.

5. Teachers are members of learning communities

Accomplished teachers contribute to the effectiveness of the school by *working collaboratively with other professionals on instructional policy, curriculum development and staff development*. They can evaluate school progress and the allocation of school resources in light of their understanding of state and local educational objectives. They are knowledgeable about specialized school and community resources that can be engaged for their students' benefit, and are skilled at employing such resources as needed.

Accomplished teachers find ways to *work collaboratively and creatively with parents*, engaging them productively in the work of the school.

Endnotes

1. Carr, W. and Kemmis, S. (1986). *Becoming Critical: Education, Knowledge and Action Research*, London: The Falmer Press.

2. Prunty, J. (1984). *A Critical Reformulation of Educational Policy*, ESA 842, Policy Development and Analysis, Victoria, Australia: Deakin University.

3. Ibid.

4. Prunty, J. J. (1985). Signposts for a critical educational policy analysis, *Australian Journal of Education*, Vol 29(2), p. 133-134.

5. U.S. Department of Education (September 1998). *Promising practices: New ways to improve teacher quality*, Washington D.C.: Author.

6. Report of the National Commission on Teaching & America's Future. (September 1996). *What matters most: Teaching for America's future*. New York: Author.

7. Darling-Hammond, L. (November 1996). "What matters most: A competent teacher for every child," *Phi Delta Kappan*, Vol 78(3), p. 193-200.

8. National Commission on Teaching and America's Future.

9. Darling-Hammond, p. 194.

10. Wise, A. E. and Libbrand, J. A. (April 2000). "Standards and teacher quality: Entering the new millennium," *Phi Delta Kappan*, Vol 81(98), p. 612-621.

11. Baratz-Snowden, J.(Summer 1994). "NBPTS and teacher professional development: The policy context," *Portfolio*, p. 4-5.

12. Carnegie Task Force on Teaching as a Profession. (1986). *A nation prepared: Teachers for the 21st century*. New York: Carnegie Forum on Education and the Economy.

13. Leading the way: Ten years of progress, 1987-1997. (1997). Southfield, MI: National Board for Professional Teaching Standards.

14. Trotter, A. (January 2001), "Paying a premium," *Education Week*, Vol XX(198), p. 18.

15. Nelson, M. (1997) "Are teachers stupid? Setting and meeting standards in social studies," ERIC NO. ED 426 035.

16. Wheeler, C. W. (1980). *NCATE: Does it matter? Research Series No 92*, East Lansing: Institute for Research on Teaching, Michigan State University.

17. Gardner, W. E., Scannell, D., and Wisniewski, R. (May 1966). "The curious case of NCATE redesign," *Phi Delta Kappan*, Vol 77(9), p. 622-629.

18. Blackwell, P. J. and Diez, M. E. (1999). *Achieving the new vision of master's education for teachers*, Washington, D.C.: National Council for the Accreditation of Teacher Education.

19. Ibid, p. 21.

20. Wise, A. E. (November 1996). "Building a system of quality assurance for the teaching profession: Moving into the 21st Century," *Phi Delta Kappan*, Vol 78(3), p. 191-192.

21. Eisner, E. (2000). *The Educational Imagination: On the Design and Evaluation of School Programs, 3rd Edition*, Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall, p. 71-72.

22. Zehm, S. J. and Kottler, J. A. (1993). *On Being a Teacher: The Human Dimension*, Corwin Press, Inc.

23. Zeichner, K. M. and Liston, D. P. (1996). *Reflective Teaching: An Introduction*, Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Publishers.

24. Zehm and Kottler.

25. Fullan, M. G. and Hargreaves, A. (1996). *What's Worth Fighting for in Your School*, NY: Teachers College Press.

26. Ibid, p. 58.

27. Blackwell, S. (1997). "The dilemma of standards-driven reform," Paper presented at the Conference on College Composition and Communication Annual Meeting, Phoenix, AZ.

28. Goodlad, J. I., (1990). *Teachers for Our Nation's Schools*, San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

29. Close, E. (November 1995). A teacher's questions, *Voices From the Middle*, Vol 2(4), p. 40-41.

30. Ibid.

31. Early adolescence/English language arts standards for National Board Certification. (September 1994). Washington, DC: National Board for Professional Teaching Standards.

32. Close, E., p. 40.

33. Myers, M. (November 1995). Dear NBPTS: Do we need another testing company? *Voices From the Middle*, Vol 2(4), p. 48-53.

34. Irvine, J. J. and Fraser, J. W. (May 3, 1998). "Warm demanders," *Education Week*.

35. Ibid.

36. Ibid.

37. Bond, L. (1998). Validity and equity in the assessment of accomplished teaching: Studies of adverse impact and the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, San Diego, CA.

38. Irvine and Fraser.

39. Wheeler.

40. Ibid, p. 463.

41. Burroughs, R., Roe, T., and Hendricks-Lee, M. (1998). Communities of practice and discourse communities: Negotiating boundaries in NBPTS certification, ERIC No. ED 42 5 150.

42. Ibid, p. 463.

43. Darling-Hammond, p.197.

44. Meier, D. (2000). *Will Standards Save Public Education?* Boston: Beacon Press.

45. Oakes, J. (Ed.), Quartz, K. H., Ryan, S., and Lipton, M. (2000). *Becoming Good American Schools: The Struggle for Civic Virtue in Education Reform*, San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

46. Rothberg, I. C., Futrell, M. H., and Lieberman, J. M. (February 1998). "National board certification: Increasing participation and assessing impacts, *Phi Delta Kappan*, Vol 79(6), p. 462-466.

47. O'Neil, J. (February 1993). "Can national standards make a difference?" *Educational Leadership*, Vol 50(5), p. 4-8.

48. Rothberg, et. al., p. 464.

49. Miller, J. (1990). *Creating Spaces and Finding Voices: Teachers Collaborating for Empowerment*, Albany, NY: State University of New York Press, p. 156.